

REMARKS

In response to the rejection of claims 3, 6, and 9-11, the claims have been amended, and new claims 12-16 have been added, so the rejection is moot.

In response to the rejection of claims 1-3, 7-8, and 10-11 under 35 USC 102(b) for allegedly being anticipated by Marmatsu (EP 1 067 535 A2), the citation does not disclose the inventions of claims 1-3, 7-8, and 10-11.

More specifically, the citation does not disclose, the ranges of ratios of wavelength to reflective index should be limited to the range of $0.241 \cdot \lambda / n_s$ to $0.362 \cdot \lambda / n_s$ as claimed in claim 1. Claims 2-3, 7-8, and 10-11 are dependent on claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

In response to the rejection of claims 4-6 and 9 under 35 USC 103(a) for being obvious in view of Marmatsu, the citation does not make the inventions of claims 4-6 and 9 obvious to those skilled in the art.

More specifically, the citation does not suggest that the ranges of ratios of wavelength to reflective index should be limited to the range of $0.241 \cdot \lambda / n_s$ to $0.362 \cdot \lambda / n_s$ as claimed in claim 1.

The applicant does not agree with the other allegations of the examiner in the office action.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Michael E. Belk/
Michael E. Belk, Reg. 33,357
Senior Patent Attorney
(914) 333-9643